

# PROPHETIC CONTROVERSY

NO. 13

Burlington, Wis., June 27, 1918.

Dear Brethren: I am very busy and can hardly spare the time to answer Mr. R. S. Salyards in his onslaught against "Strangism," as his article is headed in *Saints Herald* of June 5 last. Mr. Salyards has a great deal to say against Mr. Strang's claims and ministry, but does not seem to notice that his objections militate just as much against Joseph Smith and his claims and ministry as they do against Mr. Strang's. Nor does he notice that, in his fighting and opposing Mr. Strang's claims, that he is merely trying to prove Joseph Smith a false prophet; for first, Joseph was to have a successor, (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 27:2); second, that successor is to be appointed by revelation, (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 99:6); third, this appointing revelation must come through Joseph Smith, the Seer, and could not lawfully come through any other man; fourth, this appointing revelation must be in written form, as all other revelations are, so that it can be read by all interested, for we are commanded to "give heed to that which is written and pretend to no other revelation," (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 31:1); fifth, the person so called, must be ordained, as Joseph the Seer was, under the hands of heavenly messengers, who are the angels of God, and for the best of reasons, for those heavenly messengers or angels of God, have once been prophets of

God themselves, (Rev. of St. John 22:8, 9) and have all been ordained in this life to the priesthood, after the order of the Son of God, and all like the Son of God, when they have finished their ministry here on earth, carry their priesthood with them into the heavens, and each like him "abides a priest continually." (Inspired Heb. 7:3; Gen. 14:27-32.) It is therefore most reasonable, and right, that God should send one or more of these heavenly messengers, to ordain those whom he has called to this most holy office in the priesthood; for nothing less can confer it upon any man.

It is said in Doc. & Cov. Sec. 104:42, that "the duty of the President of the office of the High Priesthood, is to preside over the whole church, and to be like unto Moses." Behold here is wisdom; yea, to be a seer, a revelator, a translator, and a prophet; having all the gifts which God bestows upon the head of the church.

Now no man can be like unto Moses unless he is ordained as Moses was; that is, under the hands of angels, (Gal. 3:19 I. T.)

Tested by these laws and facts which God has revealed and made law to us, Mr. Strang's claims and ministry are in entire agreement. He presents a letter containing a written revelation, addressed to him; it comes through Joseph. It is a

registered letter. It is read in the presence of two witnesses by Mr. Strang, a few minutes after, being taken from the postoffice on the 9th day of July, 1844, following the death of Joseph, June 27, and is dated Nauvoo, June 19, on its back, and its inside date is June 18. It is certain no one would ever have questioned the genuineness of that letter if it had not contained the appointment of a prophet of God. No letter was ever written, mailed, sent and received by any man or set of men that carried any more evidence of genuineness with it than this letter.

But that the genuineness of that letter should be questioned, and that lies and slanders should be circulated against it, to destroy faith in it, is not to be wondered at, in this age of the world. Nor is it at all to be wondered at, that plenty of people in very good standing will hearken to, and assist in circulating those lies and slanders and falsehoods. Should we forget that the angel of God who visited Joseph three times in one night and told him that the vilest stories would be circulated against him when he entered upon his ministry? Forgery? O, Mormon prophets, you know, are great on forgery! The Book of Mormon, you know, to begin with, was a forgery! What if twelve honest men testified that they knew that it was a true and faithful record? Bah! the testimony of one, Dr. Hulbert, a man known to be corrupt to the heart's core, has more weight with the mass of the people than the testimony of one hundred of such honest men. And then, every revelation that followed in the ministry of Joseph Smith, were all forgeries and frauds also; and his whole life was a life of

fraud and imposition; didn't have one good honest hair on his whole frame! And it would be a marvel indeed, if the one who was appointed by written revelation given "through him," should pass along through this world in high esteem, honored and respected by everybody, and never once fall under the charge of fraud and forgery! That would certainly be a marvel; especially since all such charges have been the common lot of all the holy prophets since the world began. I don't know that one has ever escaped it.

Mr. Strang was the only one that presented a claim in entire harmony and agreement with the law of succession as laid down in Doctrine and Covenants, and naturally enough, the charge of fraud and forgery soon began.

It is true that Mr. Strang received his ordination and the letter of appointment before he, or anyone else in Burlington, or southern Wisconsin, had heard anything of Joseph Smith's death; and it was three months after Joseph Smith's death before he ever learned that there was such a book as the Book of Doctrine & Covenants in existence; but all the same he is charged with forging "the letter of appointment." Very natural that a man called by the voice of God, and ordained under the hands of heavenly messengers as Joseph Smith was, should be charged with the crime of forgery; but here a few very grave questions present themselves; that is: First, how did Mr. Strang KNOW that Joseph Smith would be killed? Second, how did he KNOW—under the circumstances—that he was to have a successor? Third, how did he know that that successor was to be appointed by

revelation? Fourth, how did he **KNOW** that that revelation must come through Joseph Smith, and could not lawfully come through any other man? Fifth, how did he **KNOW** that the appointing revelation **MUST** be a **WRITTEN** document? Sixth, how did he **KNOW**, that just as God told Joseph, how he had ordained him, that is by the hands of angels, so his successor must be? He had been just six months in the church, and Oh reader, you have no idea of the immensity of the task that man Strang had on his hands in the forging(?) of that letter!!! and just how he foresaw and accomplished all these things, and then **GOT POSSESSION** of the Nauvoo postoffice **MAILING STAMP**, **SOME THREE HUNDRED MILES** off, and affixed it to that letter, all by **HERE HUMAN FORESIGHT** and **ABILITY(?)** is a good deal more than we poor benighted Strangites can tell. We will have to leave the solution of all such questions as these, to the Hulberts and Howes, and the Clark Bradens, and the J. B. Turners, and the Isaac Scotts, both inside and outside of the Reorganized church, who can prove anything against the prophets of God by their mere assertions, and groundless and foolish imaginations!

Shame upon the leaders of the Reorganized church, who, after spending the greater part of their lifetimes in preaching down and refuting the numerous false charges against the prophet and seer, Joseph Smith, then turn round and aid and abet, and help to circulate the very same class of diabolical slanders and stories against the man who **ALONE** gave overwhelming proof that God had called him and anointed him to

stand in Joseph's stead, in fulfillment of his promises to his people.

When Mr. Salyards prefers to take the single testimony of a single witness, known to have been a traitor to Joseph and his brethren in Missouri, as well as to James and his brethren, in Vorce, in preference to the testimony of five or six witnesses who knew of Mr. Isaac F. Scott's perfidy and treachery, shows that the leaders of that church are getting desperate, and that they will resort to any subterfuge in order to put a plausible face on their lying claims! We have answered all their quibblings against Mr. Strang's claims many years ago logically and unanswerably, and instead of their taking up those arguments one by one, if they could, and logically answering them, they have been silent those many years gone by, then turn to, and revive those many exploded old dogmas and quibblings as if they had never seen them, or heard of them before.

And now by way of conclusion, as we have given the Law of Prophetic Succession, and shown that Mr. Strang's claims are in direct and complete harmony with that law, we will now contrast the Reorganized claim with the law of Succession as laid down by revelation in Doctrine & Covenants "and see how their claim harmonizes with this law." Harmony? There is no harmony there, as we shall soon see.

First of all, the founders of the Reorganization deny that Joseph Smith appointed **ANYONE** to succeed him by revelation, or by any other means, as: "We say that it must follow, that during this reign of confusion consequent upon the nature of this captivity, there was no call in the nature of the case for a succes-

nor to Joseph, either as presiding elder in the church, or Presiding High Priest over the Priesthood; **AND THERE HAS BEEN NONE.**" (Taken from a manifesto gotten up by Jason W. Briggs, Zenas H. Gurly, and one John Harrington, endeavoring to show the propriety of rejecting Mr. Strang and all others in 1852, eight years after the death of Joseph the Seer. See History of Joseph the Prophet, by Tullige, page 589.) Here is Jason W. Briggs' revelation:—"and in my own due time, I will call upon the seed of Joseph Smith, and I will bring one forth, and he shall be **MIGHTY** and **STRONG** and he shall preside over the High Priesthood of my church," &c. This is in the future tense, and testifies that up to 1851, no one was yet appointed to lead the church although the Almighty had promised Joseph three different times, that he would appoint one through him to succeed him. Zenas H. Gurly about this time says he had a vision in which "the spirit" told him to rise up and cast off all who claim to be prophets, and go forth and preach the gospel and say that God will raise up a prophet to complete his work."

This is also in the future tense and rejects and ignores the fact that God had appointed anyone by revelation given to, or through Joseph the Seer. And now though I have written these things nearly 30 years before, I am tempted to mention them again lest in reading over Pro. Controversy No. 3, pages 11 to 21, you may not have given these matters their due weight. But here is what Mr. W. W. Blair says:—"Joseph Smith was taken away, dying a martyr of which death he was conscious, and made preparation before it occurred. He was not

accused of the Lord of transgression, and the gift that had been conferred upon him taken from him, nor was there a command given him to appoint another in his stead, because he had been unworthy, and the Lord proposed to depose him from his office. It was only in the event of the gift being taken from him that he was to appoint another in his stead. This event did not occur." Thus you see there is a uniformity in the spirit and testimony and teachings of the founders of the Reorganized Church, that God appointed no one by revelation through Joseph, in fulfillment of his promises to his people. Now God Almighty gives the lie to the above, plainly and simply by saying: "For if it (the prophetic gift) be taken from him (Joseph) he shall not have power **EXCEPT TO APPOINT** another in his stead and this shall be **A LAW** unto you, that ye be not deceived (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 43:2)

O yes, this was given to us to govern us; that under any circumstances, whether Joseph retained or lost the prophetic gift he was to appoint another by revelation to stand in his stead, but how few regarded this law? It is self-evident the founders of the reorganized church did not regard this as a law or they never would have written and taught as they have done, as above quoted. And there are still other revelations given us as law also to the same effect, which they never called to mind, and if anything, are doubly serious and binding, as: "Verily I say unto you (Joseph) the keys of this kingdom shall never be taken from you while thou art in the world, neither in the world to come, nevertheless **THROUGH YOU**, shall the **ORACLES** be given to another, yea

even unto the church." (sec. 87:2) "The oracles" spoken of here, are evidently the revelations of God, intended to be given to the church after Joseph was taken through the one appointed by revelation through him. And now listen to the admonition of the Almighty to all those into whose hands those oracles or revelations may come: "And all those who receive the oracles of God, **LET THEM BEWARE HOW THEY HOLD THEM, LEST THEY ARE ACCOUNTED** as light thing, and are brought under condemnation thereby and stumble and fall, when the storms descend and the winds blow and the rains descend and beat upon their house." (sec. 87:2). This is testimony two, and comes with double force and emphasis, that God would plant one in Joseph's stead by revelation given through Joseph. We will add one more promise made by revelation to Joseph that God would plant another in his stead. "I have given unto him (Joseph) the keys of the mystery of those things which have been sealed, even things which were from the foundation of the world, and the things which shall come from this time (1830) until the time of my coming, if he abide in me, and if not, another will I plant in his stead," (sec. 34:4).

These testimonies will not lie, and remember that under any circumstances Joseph, and he only, was the instrument through whom the Almighty by revelation was to appoint another in his stead. All these things taken together show beyond controversy that when Joseph was taken, there was another already appointed and ordained to stand in Joseph's stead, as Joseph was called and ordained himself, that is, called by the voice of God and ordained under

the hands of angels, for that is the way that all true prophets of God have been called, constituted and made. Mr. R. S. Salyards may talk about prophets of God being ordained by the direction of a high council or general conference as much as he pleases, but we defy him and all others, to show us a single instance of a single prophet of God ever being ordained in that way, or by any such council or direction, by either Bible or Book of Mormon. If a prophet of God is present at a general conference, he can ordain any other officer in the whole priesthood, but he could not ordain his successor, and if he could not ordain his successor, then verily no other man, or set of men could. For that office "comes not by man" And no high council, or general conference was ever authorized to direct any one to ordain another to an office in the priesthood that he did not hold himself. You can risk your salvation on that! What high council or general conference directed the ordination of Joseph Smith? of Moses? of Elijah? of Melchisedec? of Joseph in Egypt? of the prophet Samuel? of Jeremiah? of the Lord Jesus? of Nephi of Alma? of Samuel the Lamanite? and many others. Can you find a single one of all of the prophets of God, whose ordination was directed by a high council, or a general conference? We have asked these questions years ago, but got no answer, and we are quite sure they never can be answered. It is universally conceded, that where the power exists to make the predecessor in office, there the power exists to make his successor. God and the angels of his presence makes, and has made all his prophets since the world began, and he alone "by the calling of his

own voice" and the ministration of angels can make their successors.

So we utterly despise the idea that a prophet of the most high God ever was made by the imposition of the hands of men. And if the whole human race could concentrate itself into one, two or three men, and undertake to ordain any one man to be a prophet of God, it would be an empty and absolute failure. That is why Brigham Young and all his successors and young Joseph Smith and his son, Mr. Fred M. Smith have all proved themselves absolute failures. Never had the ministry of angels, never saw the Urim and Thummim, never saw the ancient records, which the prophet Nephi has told us were to be handed down from father to son, or from one prophet to another till God commanded otherwise. (1st book of Nephi, chap. 5:47).

These are all prophets that prophesy not, seers that see nothing, revelators that reveal nothing, and translators that translate nothing and apostles that bring no glad tidings! The lack of all these things are the fruits of all man-made prophets. Those who make them always forget to endow them with any of the prophetic gifts. And all this should be evidence enough to every thinking man, that God never called them, or ordained them, without a word more. Prophets of God also have the privilege of seeing and talking with God face to face, and mouth to mouth even, apparently, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold" (See Num. 12:6-8. Num. 14:14. Is. 6:1, 2).

In harmony with the above inglorious assertions that Joseph the Seer appointed no one by revelation to succeed him in the prophetic of-

fice, I insert the following from tract No. 17, a tract published many years ago by the reorganized, without date, or name of the author. "The only legitimate presidency in the church since the death of Joseph, has been the representatives of the rightful heir, or the true successor.

As the guardian represents and acts for the heir, whose inheritance he has in his possession so have the only acceptable presiding authorities acted since the death of Joseph." That simply means that Jason W. Briggs, who was voted to assume the guardianship of "the rightful heir," and the church until "the rightful heir" became convinced that it was his duty to act in the prophetic office held by his father. To be a little plainer, the founders of the reorganization who had apostatized from under James J. Strang, held a conference in 1851 and voted Jason W. Briggs, president of the church, and guardian of young Joseph Smith Pro Tem until he became convinced that it was his duty to assume the duties of the prophetic office held by his father, which they said he was "rightful heir" to. And this office voted on Mr. Briggs Pro. Tem. they tell us, was "the only legitimate" (or lawful) "presidency the church had, from the death of Joseph the seer, June, 1844, till young Joseph accepted an ordination to it in 1890 at a conference held at Amboy, Illinois, under the hands of "William Marks, Zenos H. Garley and others."

For overwhelming evidence that young Joseph Smith knew nothing of an appointment by his father to him by revelation or by any other means, he says, "I did not then (1856) know whether I should ever be called to take any part in that work"—Mor-

monism—"but that if I were, I was ready, and that it would have to be made clear to me IN PERSON what that work was as well as to others.

That I could not move on the evidence of others only (Life of Joseph the Prophet Joseph by Tullige, page 768). He says again: "In the fall of this year," (1836) three events occurred that had much to do with my course religiously and aiding me to decide the question: "What part of my father's work if any I was to take. (Id. page 760.)

"While weighing my desires and capabilities for this work", (that is, the study of political law) "the question came up: 'Will I ever have anything to do with Mormonism? and if so HOW and WHAT will it be?' While engaged in this contemplation, and perplexed with these recurring questions, the room suddenly expanded and passed away," and young Joseph has a vision, but said vision did not disclose to him in any way that he had been called by revelation by any means through his father, nor even a shadow of it, (page 757.) Once more. "I believed that he who enabled my father to decide, &c &c could enable me if he would to decide whether I should or should not have anything to do with Mormonism, and if so what?"

Finally he tells us that in the year 1839 the question that he is to have something to do with Mormonism is settled, but that question was never settled by any revelation coming through his father appointing him to succeed him in the prophetic office.

If the testimony of the founders of the reorganised church and the testimony of young Joseph their prophet, prove anything it proves beyond reasonable doubt that young Jo-

seph was never called of God by revelation, through his father, to succeed him, in the prophetic office.

But that someone was appolated at the death of Joseph the seer, to succeed him in the prophetic office, admits of no manner of doubt, for says the Almighty to the church by revelation through the prophet and seer, "And this ye shall know assuredly that there is none other appointed unto you, to receive commandments and revelations until he be taken, if he abide in me." (Doc. & Cov. sec. 43:1.) This language, implies that when Joseph was taken there was another already appointed, and ordained to stand in his stead." What have we to do with all these precious promises which God made to the church about Joseph being the only one through whom God would appoint another in his stead; that the one appointed must "come in at the gate, and be ordained, as God had told Joseph before how he ordained him, namely: "I have sent unto you Peter, James and John (angels) by whom I (God) have ordained you." "Ordained you" to be what? To be APOSTLES and especial witnesses of my name, and what else were they (Joseph and Oliver) ordained to? They were ordained to bear or hold the keys of their ministry, and what else? "The keys of the same things which I revealed unto them (Peter, James and John)." Being so ordained, it was very natural that God, on the day of the organization of the church, should say to the church; "Behold a record shall be kept among you and in it thou (Joseph Smith) shall be called a SEER, a TRANSLATOR, a PROPHET, an APOSTLE of the Lord Jesus Christ," &c. What "High Council" or "general confer-

once" dictated or "directed" the ordination of Joseph and Oliver, when there was no such thing as a High Council in existence at the time of the organization of the church, and scarcely enough members to form even a decent branch of the church, that is, six members? I repeat the question: What have we to do with all the precious promises that God made to the church that Joseph was to have a successor, and that God would appoint him through Joseph, and ordain him as he ordained Joseph, if the whole business of making the head of the church is all vested in a High Council or general conference? What is a High Council? The twelve apostles are one High Council, that is "a traveling High Council." The traveling High Priests are another. The Twelve Judges in Zion form another High Council. One of these High Councils, that of the twelve apostles got together soon after the death of Joseph, and decided that Joseph was to have no successor; that the twelve apostles were the proper persons to lead the church, contrary to all the promises that God made to his people, that he would plant another in Joseph's stead, as he planted Joseph. (See Times & Seasons vol. 5, page 637.) So according to the theory that it is the business of a High Council or general conference, to ordain the head of God's church, Salt Lake City, is the proper place for Mr. Salyards, and all his reorganized brethren, and has been since 1846.

Leaving the calling and claims of James J. Strang entirely aside as the leaders of the Reorganized do, what a sorry looking picture we have of the whole church, since the day that Joseph was taken, June 27, 1844!!!

God falls first of all to appoint anyone in fulfillment of his promises; and as no one was thus appointed, no one could be ordained by any "High Council or general conference" and never could be, up to this day!!! So nothing can be clearer than that the church up to this day has been without a prophet, seer, revelator and translator. For neither among Brighamites, nor the Reorganized, from the death of Joseph up to this day has one line of revelation, coming through Joseph, been produced, appointing anyone to succeed him in the prophetic office, if you leave out the letter of appointment coming through Joseph, the prophet, to James J. Strang. So Mr. Salyards, why is it that you denounce that letter of appointment which Mr. Strang has presented in behalf of his calling as "a fraud on its face?" Where is the fraud on the face, or in its internal parts? Where is the proof of your assertions? Why sir, if that letter is a fraud in any way, the whole system of Mormonism isn't worth the paper on which it is written; for if it is not a genuine letter from Joseph Smith, dictated by the Almighty, then the oath and promises of God that he made to the church that he would plant another in his stead, have all evaporated and fallen to the ground.

You give us the testimony of James Whitehead, to the effect that he saw Joseph in a public meeting in Nauvoo ordain his son Joseph to lead the church, why did you not give us the other side of the story, told by young Joseph himself, to the effect that his father "could not ordain his successor while himself lived" (See young Joseph's letter to J. B. Price, in The Saint's Advocate



of September, 1883, vol. 6.) Whitehead's testimony is false on other grounds, namely, that it is contrary to the order of heaven that two prophets of God should be at the head of the church at the same time, and if young Joseph had been so ordained, there would then be two. In addition to Mr. Whitehead's testimony the Reorganized give us the testimony of Lyman Wight, Brigham Young, Edwin Stafford, Parley P. Pratt, W. W. Phelps, Chas. Derry, William Clayton, Arthur Millikin, Heber C. Kimball and others, to the effect that it was young Joseph's right to lead the church, and he would yet lead it. The only trouble with this testimony is that there isn't a word of truth in it. It is nearly all hearsay. Not one of those mentioned here ever had the least faith in the Reorganization, or ever joined it and the church that they all said and hoped he would yet lead, was the Utah church, and he never led that church. Bishop George Miller and George J. Adams are linked into the above number. If George J. Adams had any knowledge that young Joseph was appointed to succeed his father, it is strange indeed that he should fall into the ranks of James J. Strang, and continue with him for years, advocating his claims, until for good cause he was cut off from that church and during all that time (1845 to 1851) he hadn't a word to say about young Joseph being called to fill father's place, and never joined the Reorganized church! And as for Bishop George Miller, his own words in regard to that matter are, that "from hints and innuendoes which I frequently heard, I was induced to believe that Joseph had designated his son to succeed him in

the prophetic office, and on this belief I rested."

The plain and simple matter of fact is, that the whole story of young Joseph being appointed to fill the prophetic office, is built on the "hints and innuendoes" of a few designing men, determined to lead the church and ride into power at any cost; and to accomplish this, they said and taught anything that they thought would cover up their usurpations; hence while they were blinding Bishop Miller with "hints and innuendoes" in regard to young Joseph being appointed they on the other hand were teaching and proclaiming that Joseph was to have no successor, saying "Let no man presume for a moment that Joseph's place will be filled by another." (See Epistle of the Twelve, Times and Seasons, Aug. 15, 1844) signed by Brigham Young.

Bishop Miller says further, that "subsequent to these times of intense excitement, (following the death of Joseph) I had frequent attempts at a conversation with Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball in regard to Joseph's leaving one to succeed him in the prophetic office, and in all my attempts to ascertain the desired truth as to that personage, I was invariably met with the innuendo "stop" or "hush" brother Miller; let there be nothing said in regard to this matter, or we will have little Joseph killed as his father was, inferring indirectly, that Joseph had appointed his son to succeed him in the prophetic office, and I believe this impression was not left on my mind alone, but on the brethren in general, and remains with many until this day," (1855, see Bishop Miller's correspondence, page 23.) Bishop Miller rejoiced with exceeding

great joy when he investigated Mr. Strang's claims, found them true and lived and died in his rejoicing and scouted the idea that the son of Joseph was appointed.

Now it is from these "hints and innuendoes" that the idea started that Joseph the Seer appointed his son to succeed him, and a more groundless hint or innuendo was never given by man on any subject, for if young Joseph had been appointed, he would have known it himself before, or at least as quick as any other man; and more than that, he would have produced a written revelation coming through his father, pointing him out, instead of leaving it to the Toms, Dicks and Harrys, and the forbidden and unauthorized revelations of the Briggses and Gurleys and others who rose up with their revelations some eleven or twelve years after the prophet and seer is taken, to inform his son, (who is absolutely unconscious of any such call) that he is called to fill his father's office! The promised and appointing revelation coming through the prophet Joseph, is the grand key that lets in the light and glory of God, on this whole subject, and he who has received it, through the hands of the prophet Joseph, is master of the situation, and God is his right hand man, living or dead. And whatsoever he gives us as revelation or translation, may be held on to as the "rod of iron, that leads to the tree of life. And whosoever reproaches it, or opposes it, he is merely trying to prove that Joseph was a false prophet, and Mormonism an imposture. It does not matter a hair, who the man is that God appoints through Joseph, he will and must make precisely the same claim that James J. Strang

made, no other will fill the bill, and only one could be so appointed, and he is the proper person to tell how he was **ORDAINED** and where and when.

Mr. R. S. Salyards, why are you startled at the idea that Joseph Smith and James J. Strang were both ordained under the hands of angels? Was not Moses ordained under the hands of angels? (Gal. 3:19). So here are three witnesses that prophets of God are ordained under the hands of angels. To these instances we may add that John the Baptist was also ordained by angels, and when the full history of the ordination of all the Holy prophets is given, I doubt not that every one of them from Adam to Joseph, and James were all so ordained. It must be so, for God does not work at random, in the making of his prophets. And remember that the ordination of all men to the holy priesthood invariably implies the laying on of the hands of the ordainer. The reorganized leaders are the only set of men who have put forth the doctrine that the holy priesthood is conferred without the laying on of hands. It is only one of the many other follies and false doctrines taught by them. They have no need to point at the follies of others. Let them look homeward, and they will find enough to occupy their thoughts for a good long while, in pondering and setting things in order and harmony with the word of God. Their classifying Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and Moses and all the best men of the Bible in their marriage relations with "dogs and sorcerers and whore mongers and idolaters, and murderers and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie," is only what we should look for in the teachings of false prophets

and false teachers, such as we have been describing above, (Rev.22:15, chap. 21:8).

In setting forth the claims of James J. Strang and the plain and honest facts in proof of his calling, it would seem that this should be enough to justify faith in all that he has taught us as the word of the Lord, for the command given the church in Joseph's day was that we should give heed to all his words and commandments as he received them, for his word ye shall receive as if from mine own mouth in all patience and faith, for such a command is always given the saints in every age when God sends them a prophet, and no prophet of God ever was known to give any people anything but the word of the Lord. When he said that what he gave them was the word of the Lord, that ended the matter, and when they set up their own judgment against it they erred in every instance, and brought the judgments of God upon themselves. So it is in this age, so it ever will be. "Believe in the Lord, so shall ye be established, believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper," has ever been the admonition of righteous kings and prophets, and the opposite way brings distress and calamity, and the present nearly universal war is all traceable to the disregard of the counsels of Jehovah. Supposing we should follow the counsel of the reorganized anti-Mormons, and turn away from Mr. Strang because he brought the doctrine of plural marriage to light, what then? Why my dear Mr. Salyards, the turning away has only begun! for we must then for the same reason turn away from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all that is written of them in the book

of Genesis. And as the five Books of Moses simply grow out of the history of the Patriarchs and as the man Moses was also a "polygamist," those five books are not worth the paper on which they are written, and as all the history that follows up to the first coming of Christ are all based on the history and claims of the Patriarchs and the works of Moses, we must part with them all. Perhaps you will think this extravagant, but for the life of me, I know not how to avoid the rejecting of the Patriarchs if it is the proper thing to reject James J. Strang on account of plural marriage, and by consequence, we must reject Moses and all his writings and all the prophets that followed Moses, for they are all linked together as the successive links in a common chain, one link being broken, they will all fall together! So my dear reorganized friends, what have we to fall back on as an alternative? Simply atheism or infidelity, that is all. So in order to avoid atheism or infidelity we hang on to Mr. Strang and all his revelations, with Joseph Smith his predecessor, and his letter of appointment and all the Patriarchs and prophets and all the apostles, for in rejecting one of these we reject them all. In fact should we reject Mr. Strang on account of plural marriage, we must also reject Joseph Smith, for the day has come, when you can no longer deny that Joseph Smith was the very MAN WHO FIRST BROUGHT TO LIGHT the doctrine of "polygamy" in THIS GENERATION. The evidence, now accumulated of that fact, is simply overwhelming. You may pettifog the contrary as much as you like, to keep up popularity, but the weight of the evidence will bear you down, and the

final verdict will hang you, in the eyes of all people.

There are other things that I would like to speak of here, but cannot go but a little farther, for the times are busy. Bear in mind that the founders of the reorganized church all deny that God appointed any one to succeed Joseph. I have given you their testimony and their revelations to that effect. After a good many years pass, up stands James Whitehead and contradicts these men by saying that he saw Joseph and Hiram Smith in a public congregation in Nauvoo, anoint his son Joseph to be his successor, and that this took place in the spring before Joseph was killed. Then some years after Whitehead's testimony, young Joseph arises and contradicts Whitehead by saying that his "father could not ordain and induct a successor while himself lived." And Mr. Salyards you keep up the story of Mr. Whitehead as if it was a written, unquestioned fact!"

You ask "what has Strangism accomplished?" We frankly confess that by reason of the usurpation of Brigham Young and the false and forbidden revelations and teachings of the Briggses and the Garleys and the Granville Hedrics, and a lot of others we haven't accomplished a great deal. The plain and simple truth of the whole matter is, that pretty nearly the whole church has been brought under the dominion of Satan, by false leaders, and their false doctrines and teachings. And the prophet Isaiah might well cry out, touching these times: "O my people, they who lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths!" And Ezekiel also has a very apt illustration of it by comparing the leaders

to fat cattle, standing in the stream above, trampling and pawing and defouling the water for the flock below to drink of it. This of course refers to their foul interpretations of the word of God, and their false and unauthorized revelations, (see Isaiah chap. 4:12. Ezek. 18:19) Strangites have not done as well as they might, but Strangism, which is only another name for "true Mormonism," has done more than all the other class of Mormons put together, for the Almighty has decreed that all the works of the usurper are vain, and that he will acknowledge none of them.

Strangism has proved the truth of Mormonism, as nothing else has proved it, that God, true to his word, raised up and planted one in Joseph's stead, and gave him the "Keys of the mysteries and the revelations which were sealed," gave him the Urim and Thummim, and the ancient records to translate from them, gave him also the ministry of angels, and gave him also the privilege of speaking with him face to face, as a man speaks with his friend, by whom we have the promise of an inheritance in the life to come, that fades not away. Call us "fanatics" if you will but if we are fanatics, so were all the saints in days of old, and in the time of Joseph the Seer.

While we have not accomplished much to boast of, there are some things that we have NOT done that we are rather proud of. We have never rejected any prophet of God nor any of the revelations that God gave them. Nor have we ever entertained the idea that we knew better what God ought to reveal than the prophet whom God called by his own voice, and sent his angels to anoint and ordain. It has never yet en-

tered into our hearts to get up a re-organization of the church, and place over it a prophet of our own make, and we have never yet so interpreted the scriptures as to make the lives of the patriarchs and prophets a life of WHOREDOM, and thus classed them with "dogs and sorcerers and whore mongers and idolaters and murderers and whosoever LOVETH and MAKETH a lie, (Rev. 22:15, 21:8). You observe Mr. Salyards that he that LOVES lies is classed with the man that MAKES them, and all the other great criminals spoken of above and very justly too. So you and yours should beware lest you consign yourselves into the class above spoken of. As for myself and others who have known Mr. Strang, we would about as soon think that Moses, Elijah or Enoch would stoop to the crime of forgery, as that Mr. Strang would. And in the name of Israel's God, we denounce Mr. Isaac Scott as an unmitigated liar, and falsifier. "In times, ye shall have no king nor ruler, but I will be your king and watch over you," is a saying that has often been quoted against Mr. Strang. The enemy can see the word king here in very large and glaring letters, but the word "ruler" they don't see it at all!

One thing is certain, that where the Priesthood after the order of the son of God is, there is the kingly office. Melchizedec held this office and he was a king. Moses had the same priesthood and he was a king, so we are told in two places, (Num. 23:21, Deut. 33:5).

Jesus in virtue of holding that office was a king, Nephi and Mosiah were prophets and kings also. And if it be true, that "all those who are ordained unto THIS priesthood," are

made like unto the son of God, then as he was a king, so are they. And YOU can't DENY it. Joseph Smith held this same office, and as a matter of course, carried the office of king in that office. And as Joseph was promised a successor, the same was true of him. He also carried in his office the office of king, for the office of king as all other offices in the Priesthood is an appendage, or belongs to the Priesthood after the order of the son of God. And as Mr. Strang who was Joseph Smith's lawful successor, was taken in 1856, there has been no one among the people called Latterday Saints holding the Priesthood after the order of the son of God,—no prophet, seer, revelator, or translator, and consequently there has been no king nor ruler, or director among them. It appears, and pretty clearly too, that at the time the above words were spoken, "In time, ye shall have no king nor ruler," &c., that there was then a king or supreme governing power in the church, but that at some time in this generation, there would be "no king nor ruler" of God's appointing just as it is now, and has been, among Latterday Saints, so called since 1856. Haven't the re-organized some queer ideas in regard to kings? They seem to think that under a king there can be no liberty! Do they mean to say that under Nephi there was no liberty? nor under Melchizedec? nor under Mosiah? nor King Benjamin? nor under King David? nor under any of the righteous kings of Israel? There is one mighty and strong promised to the House of Israel in these latter days, of whom it may be well to spend a little thought. He is to be mighty and strong HOLDING the scepter of

power in his hand. He will be a king as sure as you live, Mr. Salyards and don't you forget it.

Now although the kingly office is carried, and contained in the prophetic office, as indeed all other offices in the Priesthood are, it does not follow that it is always exercised by them. It seems that even prophets of God must be called, and ordained to that office as in the case of Moses and Melchizedec, and Joseph and James, Nephi and the Lord Jesus, and various others. I knew James J. Strang personally and well, and am acquainted with all his revelations, and translations, so far as they have been published, and I find, after many years study and experience that the word of God given us through the prophet James, are just as faithful and true as the word of God given at any time through the prophet Joseph Smith. Hence, the foundation upon which we stand, is Joseph Smith and all the revelations and translations which he has given us as the word of God, including the revelation appointing James J. Strang to succeed him. And side by side with all these things, we associate all the revelations, and translations of Mr. Strang as a part of that foundation, and of equal authority with those of Joseph.

Figure on all these matters as we will, we must yet come to the conclusion that all the darkness, division, confusion, doubt, and uncertainty that have come over the people called Latterday Saints since Joseph Smith

was taken, are all due, and plainly traceable to the rejection of the revelation coming through Joseph that appointed James J. Strang to succeed him. The reorganized have made more noise about this darkness, doubt and division than any others, yet I don't know of any set of people who have done more to cause this darkness, uncertainty and doubt, than they have themselves. I do not know this day of a more groundless, and foundationless structure on earth than the reorganized church! The revelations upon which it is built have all turned out to be false. The men who gave those revelations were all false and unauthorized teachers and revelators. Their teaching that the Prophetic office goes down by lineage, is a false and most unfounded doctrine. The men who undertook to ordain young Joseph a prophet, seer, revelator, and translator to fill his father's place, were all apostate, and the reorganized church has been all along from 1860 up to this day 1918 as destitute of any true Priesthood as any one of the sectarian churches. And now if there is a man anywhere anxious to investigate, any one or all of these assertions, we promise to send him a document that will satisfy on that point, and finally, should we ever lose faith in "Strangism" (which God forbid we ever should) we would not know where to advise a man to go to get a lawful baptism!

WINGFIELD WATSON,

Burlington, Wis.



